



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/020,909	12/19/2001	Abdus Samad Kudrolli	KSIPL-2	1482
7590	05/30/2006		EXAMINER	
Jay P. Kesan 2420 Nottingham Champaign, IL 61821			RUTLEDGE, AMELIA L	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2176	

DATE MAILED: 05/30/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/020,909

Applicant(s)

KUDROLLI ET AL.

Examiner

Amelia Rutledge

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 March 2006.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Amendment, filed 03/09/2006.
2. Claims 1-25 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 17, 22, and 25 are independent claims.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

3. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 03/09/2006 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. **Claims 1-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Harrada et al. (hereinafter "Harrada"), U.S. Patent No. 6,246,442, issued June 2001.**

Regarding independent claim 1 and dependent claims 27 and 28, Harrada teaches a computer executable method of displaying a broadcasting program guide table of columns and rows forming cells, to optimally display information selected by a user, determining an optimum cell size and cell layout, and the degree of detail of information (Abstract; Col. 6, l. 14-65). Harrada teaches determining the display space requirements (DSR) for displaying the information elements within the cells (Fig. 52, Fig. 56; Col. 8, l. 13-31). Harrada teaches moderating the DSR of an element to determine the moderated DSR value by reducing the value of the element such that the amount of reduction depends on the difference between the DSR value of the element and a value representative of the DSR values of the elements corresponding to the column or row to which the element corresponds, since Harrada teaches determining the optimum size of a cell and adjusting the size of adjacent cells (Fig. 56; Col. 56, l. 46-Col. 57, l. 29) as well as reducing the font size of text elements to an optimum size (Col. 27, l. 35-Col. 28, l. 48). Similarly, Harrada teaches displaying the elements in the space allocated to the corresponding cells. Harrada teaches allocating column widths and row heights based on the ModDSR values such that the table size does not exceed the width and height of the predetermined display space (Col. 64, l. 9-38; Claim 1). Further, it is inherent in the disclosure of Harrada that the table size of the program guide would be calculated not to exceed the width and height of the screen, since the table cell elements are compacted to show the maximum possible amount of program guide elements (Col. 16, l. 1-39, especially l. 33-39).

Regarding dependent claim 2, Harrada teaches measuring text of a uniform font size, permitted minimum font size, and measuring text using a uniform font size for each group of elements required to be displayed using a common font size (Col. 27, l. 35-Col. 28, l. 48).

Regarding dependent claim 3, Harrada teaches determining the DSR of text elements after abbreviating the text (Col. 26, l. 30-67).

Regarding dependent claim 4, Harrada teaches at least (d) any representative value derived from the DSR values of one or more elements corresponding to the column or row, respectively, since Harrada teaches reducing the font size of text elements to an optimum size (Col. 27, l. 35-Col. 28, l. 48) for a group of cells.

Regarding dependent claim 5, Harrada teaches determining a measure of the space wastage inherent to a matrix format display, since Harrada teaches determining the optimum size of a cell and adjusting the size of adjacent cells (Fig. 56; Col. 56, l. 46-Col. 57, l. 29) as well as reducing the font size of text elements to an optimum size (Col. 27, l. 35-Col. 28, l. 48). Similarly, Harrada teaches displaying the elements in the space allocated to the corresponding cells. Harrada teaches allocating column widths and row heights based on the ModDSR values such that the table size does not exceed the width and height of the predetermined display space (Col. 64, l. 9-38; Claim 1).

Regarding dependent claim 6, Harrada teaches determining the optimum size of a cell and adjusting the size of adjacent cells (Fig. 56; Col. 56, l. 46-Col. 57, l. 29).

Regarding dependent claims 7 and 8, Harrada teaches determining the optimum distribution of elements across columns and across rows, i.e., the X and Y

axis; and allocating cell widths based on the X or Y axis restrictive condition, i.e. row heights or column widths, respectively (Col. 61, l. 32-Col. 62, l. 64).

Regarding dependent claim 9, Harrada teaches measuring text of a uniform font size, and measuring text using a uniform font size for each group of elements required to be displayed using a common font size (Col. 27, l. 35-Col. 28, l. 48).

Regarding dependent claim 10, Harrada teaches determining the DSR of text elements after abbreviating the text (Col. 26, l. 30-67).

Regarding dependent claims 11 and 12, Harrada teaches determining the display space requirements (DSR) for displaying the information elements within the cells (Fig. 52, Fig. 56; Col. 8, l. 13-31), to determine an optimal display size, the minimum space required to display the maximum amount of information elements in tabular format. Harrada teaches calculating DSR with regard to user preferences relating to degree of information detail, i.e., acceptable extent of text abbreviation (col. 57, l. 36-50).

Regarding dependent claim 13, Harrada teaches an embodiment where elements of the table include images, instead of text strings, and the images include reduced size icons to reduce their DSR (Col. 24, l. 29-63).

Regarding dependent claim 14, Harrada teaches that a variety of different images may be used in the guide cells (Col. 37, l. 1-15). It is inherent in the disclosure of Harrada that the proportion of reduction would be less for a smaller image and more for a larger image, since Harrada teaches the use of both icons, with small degree of

reduction (Fig. 33), and representative pictures of broadcasting programs, which would have a larger degree of reduction so as to be able to fit within the tabular display.

Regarding dependent claim 15, Harrada teaches determining the optimum size of a cell and adjusting the size of adjacent cells to be smaller so that they will not overlap the larger cell containing more information (Fig. 56; Col. 56, l. 46-Col. 57, l. 29; especially l. 9-28).

Regarding dependent claim 16, Harrada teaches a printer functioning as the output unit (Col. 66, l. 21).

Regarding independent claim 17, Harrada teaches a computer executable method of displaying a broadcasting program guide table of columns and rows forming cells, to optimally display information selected by a user, determining an optimum cell size and cell layout, and the degree of detail of information (Abstract; Col. 6, l. 14-65). Harrada teaches determining the display space requirements (DSR) for displaying the information elements within the cells (Fig. 52, Fig. 56; Col. 8, l. 13-31). Harrada teaches moderating the DSR of an element to determine the moderated DSR value by reducing the value of the element such that the amount of reduction depends on the difference between the DSR value of the element and a value representative of the DSR values of the elements corresponding to the column or row to which the element corresponds, since Harrada teaches determining the optimum size of a cell and adjusting the size of adjacent cells (Fig. 56; Col. 56, l. 46-Col. 57, l. 29) as well as reducing the font size of text elements to an optimum size (Col. 27, l. 35-Col. 28, l. 48). Similarly, Harrada teaches displaying the elements in the space allocated to the corresponding cells.

Harrada teaches determining the optimum distribution of elements across columns and across rows, i.e., the X and Y axis; and allocating cell widths based on the X or Y axis restrictive condition, i.e. row heights or column widths, respectively (Col. 61, l. 32-Col. 62, l. 64), compare to *measuring the lopsidedness of distribution of larger elements across columns and across rows*; and correspondingly allocating column widths or row heights. Harrada teaches allocating column widths and row heights based on the ModDSR values such that the table size does not exceed the width and height of the predetermined display space (Col. 64, l. 9-38; Claim 1). Further, it is inherent in the disclosure of Harrada that the table size of the program guide would be calculated not to exceed the width and height of the screen, since the table cell elements are compacted to show the maximum possible amount of program guide elements (Col. 16, l. 1-39, especially l. 33-39).

Regarding dependent claims 18 and 19, Harrada teaches moderating the DSR of an element to determine the moderated DSR value by reducing the value of the element such that the amount of reduction depends on the difference between the DSR value of the element and a value representative of the DSR values of the elements corresponding to the column or row to which the element corresponds, since Harrada teaches determining the optimum size of a cell and adjusting the size of adjacent cells (Fig. 56; Col. 56, l. 46-Col. 57, l. 29) as well as reducing the font size of text elements to an optimum size (Col. 27, l. 35-Col. 28, l. 48). Harrada teaches allocating column widths and row heights based on the ModDSR values such that the table size does not

exceed the width and height of the predetermined display space (Col. 64, l. 9-38; Claim 1).

Regarding dependent claims 20 and 21, Harrada teaches determining the optimum distribution of elements across columns and across rows, i.e., the X and Y axis; and allocating cell widths based on the X or Y axis restrictive condition, i.e. the higher of row heights or column widths, respectively (Col. 61, l. 32-Col. 62, l. 64).

Regarding independent claim 22, Harrada teaches a computer executable method of displaying a broadcasting program guide table of columns and rows forming cells, to optimally display information selected by a user, determining an optimum cell size and cell layout, and the degree of detail of information (Abstract; Col. 6, l. 14-65). Harrada teaches determining the display space requirements (DSR) for displaying the information elements within the cells (Fig. 52, Fig. 56; Col. 8, l. 13-31). Harrada teaches moderating the DSR of an element to determine the moderated DSR value by reducing the value of the element such that the amount of reduction depends on the difference between the DSR value of the element and a value representative of the DSR values of the elements corresponding to the column or row to which the element corresponds, since Harrada teaches determining the optimum size of a cell and adjusting the size of adjacent cells (Fig. 56; Col. 56, l. 46-Col. 57, l. 29) as well as reducing the font size of text elements to an optimum size (Col. 27, l. 35-Col. 28, l. 48). Similarly, Harrada teaches displaying the elements in the space allocated to the corresponding cells. Harrada teaches allocating column widths and row heights based on the ModDSR values such that the table size does not exceed the width and height of the

predetermined display space (Col. 64, l. 9-38; Claim 1). Further, it is inherent in the disclosure of Harrada that the table size of the program guide would be calculated not to exceed the width and height of the screen, since the table cell elements are compacted to show the maximum possible amount of program guide elements (Col. 16, l. 1-39, especially l. 33-39).

Regarding dependent claim 23, Harrada teaches determining the optimum size of a cell and adjusting the size of adjacent cells (Fig. 56; Col. 56, l. 46-Col. 57, l. 29) as well as reducing the font size of text elements to an optimum size (Col. 27, l. 35-Col. 28, l. 48). Similarly, Harrada teaches displaying the elements in the space allocated to the corresponding cells. Harrada teaches allocating column widths and row heights based on the ModDSR values such that the table size does not exceed the width and height of the predetermined display space (Col. 64, l. 9-38; Claim 1). Further, it is inherent in the disclosure of Harrada that the table size of the program guide would be calculated not to exceed the width and height of the screen, since the table cell elements are compacted to show the maximum possible amount of program guide elements (Col. 16, l. 1-39, especially l. 33-39).

Regarding dependent claim 24, Harrada teaches using a background color to make up for loss of alignment of cells across columns or rows, as when icons are substituted for text and program genre groups (Col. 22, l. 37 -Col. 23, l. 20).

Regarding independent claim 25, claim 25 reflects the system used for implementing the method as claimed in claim 1, and is rejected along the same rationale.

Regarding dependent claim 26, Harrada teaches specifying text of a uniform font size, permitted minimum font size, and measuring text using a uniform font size for each group of elements required to be displayed using a common font size (Col. 27, l. 35-Col. 28, l. 48).

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-25 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. The new grounds of rejection includes the Harrada patent, which is being relied upon to teach the newly claimed limitation *such that the total width of all the columns and the total height of all the rows do not exceed the width and height, respectively, of the predetermined two dimensional display space*; (Claim 1). A new search resulted in the new grounds of rejection, which anticipates the claimed invention under the broadest reasonable interpretation of the claims.


Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Amelia Rutledge whose telephone number is 571-272-7508. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 9:30 - 6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on 571-272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

AR


HEATHER R. HERNDON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100